

NEPA No.: AK-040-01-AD-001

Administrative Determination (AD)
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

A. **BLM Office:** Anchorage Field Office **Lease/Serial/Case File No.** NA

Proposed Action Title/Type: CCSC Road Improvement

Location of Proposed Action: Campbell Tract; Seward Meridian, T. 12 N., R. 3 W.,
Section 3; USGS topographic map Anchorage A-8.

Description of the Proposed Action:

The Proposed Action is to provide planning and design services for improvements of an unpaved road extending one mile within the Campbell Tract Facility. The road, originally built as a WWII aircraft taxiway, provides access to the Campbell Creek Science Center (CCSC), a BLM facility constructed on the northeast end of the Campbell Tract. The road surface is approximately 50' wide, but most of the original surfacing has eroded away to the current subbase material exposing rocks. The vertical alignment of the road needs improvements to meet geometric requirements and repair of soft spots, however, the horizontal alignment of the road will be retained since the road has a natural gas pipeline on the north side, and an underground electrical line on the south side. The southern most portion of the road was originally a smaller access road, and not an aircraft taxiway. The road begins at its intersection with the Campbell Tract administrative road and ends at a gate a short distance beyond the CCSC parking area. The Proposed Action design is for two 10-foot traffic lanes using high float D-1 with asphalt and a dust-palative (a surface which will reduce dust and provide a smooth hard driving surface) with three foot gravel shoulders. Cross slope and grade minimums are planned according to the appropriate code recommendations. Regulatory and informational signs will be strategically placed along the road as well as edge and center line markings. Drainage culverts will be placed where needed. The existing gravel base will require grading and shaping before the placement of crushed base-material.

The road will be designed for a speed of 25 miles per hour. A single layer of geo-textile fabric will be used. The shoulder and disturbed areas along the road will be reclaimed with topsoil and revegetated. Re-seeding will require use of native Alaska plant species. BLM will review in advance the native Alaska plant seed mix in advance.

The Science Center's parking lot was originally the site of a WWII aircraft parking pad. In 1995, improvements were made to provide parking for approximately 12 vehicles and a few buses. The gravel pad will be slightly enlarged to accommodate 35 vehicles.

Administrative Determination (AD) (Cont'd.)

Construction of the new parking area will be undertaken with a minimal amount of clearing of vegetation that has encroached since the pad was built. Site preparation will require removal of two existing grass-covered mounds, and relocation and upgrade of the existing parking lot lighting system. Handicapped parking is available nearby and will not be disturbed except during blending with the high float material to be used for the new parking area.

Road surfacing employing a single-course of High Float Asphalt Emulsion Surface Treatment will eliminate or significantly reduce the existing problem of road dust along the access road corridor and will help to improve air quality.

To improve public safety and improve accessibility, Moose Track Trail will be upgraded to encourage users to walk along the trail rather than along the entry road. Upgrades will include providing for a firm, stable finished surface that brings the level of accessibility of the trail up to the Outdoor Developed Areas Standards as provided for in the *Regulatory Negotiation Committee on Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas*, Final Report, 9/30/99.

Applicant: BLM

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name: *Southcentral Management Framework Plan*

Date Approved: November 1980

Name: *A Management Plan for Public Use and Resource Management on the Bureau of Land Management Campbell Tract Facility*

Date Approved: June 1988

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions: Activity objectives Recreation (R-3) and Wildlife (WL-4)

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action.

EA-AK-040-8025: *Environmental Assessment: Public Use and Resource Management on the Bureau of Land Management Campbell Tract Facility. On file in the Anchorage Field Office.*

Administrative Determination (AD) (Cont'd.)

EA-AK-040-92-003: *Campbell Creek Environmental Education Center Development Plan and Environmental Assessment, February 1993.*

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the current Proposed Action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?**

Yes. The current Proposed Action conforms with the intent of the development plan and environmental assessment prepared for the development of the environmental education center (1993), and *A Management Plan for Public Use and Resource Management on the Bureau of Land Management Campbell Tract Facility* (1988). The proposed activities are either the same or substantially the same activities as described in the above listed EA. The proposed road will follow the existing road alignment. Plans call for two 12 ft. wide traffic lanes, 4 ft. wide shoulders and 6 ft. wide landscaped borders. Existing road widths vary between 25 to 45 ft. When completed, the project will have a smaller roadway “footprint” and eliminate dust impact. Improvements planned for Moose Tract Trail will promote wheelchair accessibility.

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current Proposed Action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?**

Yes. Additional alternatives beyond the No Action Alternative were not viewed as necessary at the time of analysis.

- 3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the Proposed Action?**

Yes, the circumstances have not changed. The management goals of the 1988 management plan remain basically the same, and today’s recreational uses and interest remain basically identical to those of 1988 and 1993.

Administrative Determination (AD) (Cont'd.)

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current Proposed Action?

Yes. The approach used in the previous documents is appropriate. The analyses in the documents is similar to what would be appropriate for the Proposed Action. User groups and BLM's management decisions have changed little since 1988 or 1993.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current Proposed Action?

Yes, the impacts of the current Proposed Action are unchanged from the existing NEPA documentation.

No additional direct or indirect impacts have been identified for the Proposed Action. The above listed environmental assessments examined the operation plans for the specific site in question. The road and Proposed Action is substantially the same Proposed Action analyzed in EA-AK-040-8025 and included in the EA-AK-040-92-003. Thus, the site specific analysis is substantially the same.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current Proposed Action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Yes. The cumulative impacts are unchanged from the impacts that were analyzed in the existing NEPA documents. The Proposed Action is essentially a maintenance upgrade of existing facilities and will decrease some impacts from dust.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current Proposed Action?

Yes. Intra-agency consultation has been completed. Public concerns and issues remain basically unchanged. The project was discussed several times with the Campbell Tract/Far North Bicentennial Park users group and no concerns were

Administrative Determination (AD) (Cont'd.)

raised. The Proposed Action does not warrant further public involvement.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Team Members

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource Represented</u>
Donna Redding	Archaeologist	Cultural/Paleontology
Bruce Seppi	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, T&E
Jeff Denton	Subsistence Biologist	Subsistence

F. Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are required. Design of the project included measures to mitigate impacts that could potentially occur. These included narrowing the road, re-vegetation along the shoulders, use of a surfacing material to maintain a gravel road appearance, relocating signs to better serve the public, and improving the trail next to the road to reduce the potential of public and vehicle collision.

G. Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM=s compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

/s/ June Bailey, Acting
Anchorage Field Manager

May 17, 2002
Date